

10

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action of January 8, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Response, claims 49-54 are pending. Claims 1-48 are canceled in this application. The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments and that a new search is not necessary.

SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments.

CLAIMS

Claim 13

Claim 13 was rejected because of improper dependent form. Claim 13 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 49

Applicants traverse all of the §102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action. Newly added claim 48 is allowable over the art of record because the art of record does not teach, disclose, or suggest, print media having cationic guanidine polymer compounds such as those represented by formula III, formula IV, formula V, formula VI, formula VII, and formula VIII, in combination with metallic salts, as recited in the claim 49. As a result, the art of record does not teach the features of claim 49. Therefore, the rejection of claim 49 should be withdrawn.

Claims 50-53

Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 50-53 include every feature of independent claim 49 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 49. Thus, pending dependent claims 50-53 are also allowable over the prior art of record. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 54

Newly added claim 54 is allowable over the art of record because the art of record does not teach, disclose, or suggest a method of forming print media by mixing cationic guanidine polymer compounds such as those represented by formula III, formula IV, formula V, formula VI, formula VII, and formula VIII, and metallic salts with the fibrous component, as recited in the claim 54. As a result, the art of record does not teach the features of claim 54. Therefore, the rejection of claim 54 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

In addition, any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No. 47,751